

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

BRIAN J. ROBB,	)	
	)	CASE NO. 4:17CV1156
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
	)	
BARBARA A. LYNN, TR, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	<b><u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u></b>
	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b> [NUNC PRO TUNC AS OF
	)	SEPTEMBER 7, 2017]

On June 2, 2017, Plaintiff Brian Robb filed an Application to Confirm Arbitration Award. [ECF No. 1](#). The Court hereby confirms the arbitration award of the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority Dispute Resolution (“FINRA-DR”) issued on or about August 12, 2011 against Defendant Barbara A. Lynn in FINRA-DR Case No. 10-02870.

**I: BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff was the defendant in an arbitration before FINRA-DR, arbitration No. 10-02870, captioned *Barbara A. Lynn, and Barbara A. Lynn, Trustee of the Barbara A. Lynn Trust, under Agreement dated November 10, 2008 vs. Stifel Nicolaus & Company and Brian J. Robb, et al.* FINRA-DR. During this arbitration, Plaintiff submitted an application for expungement of records maintained by the Central Registration Depository (“CRD”) of FINRA. On August 12, 2011, FINRA-DR issued an arbitration award. The award included the recommendation of expungement of any record of the charges brought against Plaintiff in the arbitration that the CRD maintained. Now, Plaintiff seeks a judgment entry confirming the arbitration award.

## II: STANDARD OF REVIEW

Judicial review of an arbitrator's decision is "very narrow." *Lattimer-Stevens Co. Vv. United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO, Dist. 27, Sub-Dist. 5*, 913 F.2d 1166, 1169 (6th Cir. 1990). Indeed, it is "one of the narrowest standards of judicial review in all of American jurisprudence." *Id.*

A federal court "must grant [an order confirming an arbitral award] unless the award is vacated, modified, or corrected." 9 U.S.C. § 9. In fact, "[t]he Federal Arbitration Act presumes that arbitration awards will be confirmed." *Dawahare v. Spencer*, 210 F.3d 666, 669 (6th Cir. 2000) (citing 9 U.S.C. § 9). "Courts thus do not sit to hear claims of factual or legal error by an arbitrator as an appellate court does in reviewing decisions of lower courts. [ . . . ] [A]s long as the arbitrator is even arguably construing or applying the contract and acting within the scope of his authority, that a court is convinced he committed serious error does not suffice to overturn his decision." *United Paperworkers Int'l Union v. Misco, Inc.*, 484 U.S. 29, 38 (1987). Under the express terms of the FAA, an award may be vacated only in the following instances:

- (1) where the award was procured by corruption, fraud, or undue means;
- (2) where there was evident partiality or corruption in the arbitrators, or either of them;
- (3) where the arbitrators were guilty of misconduct in refusing to postpone the hearing, upon sufficient cause shown, or in refusing to hear evidence pertinent and material to the controversy; or of any other misbehavior by which the rights of any party have been prejudiced; or
- (4) where the arbitrators exceeded their powers, or so imperfectly executed them that a mutual, final, and definite award upon the subject matter submitted was not made.

9 U.S.C. § 10.

(4:17CV1156)

### III: DISCUSSION

In this case, the parties arbitrated a dispute, and on August 12, 2011, FINRA-DR issued an award that included recommending the expungement of records maintained by the CRD as related to the charges brought against Plaintiff in the arbitration. [ECF No. 1-2](#). Prior to the arbitration, the parties entered into a submission agreement, whereby a judgment could be entered upon the arbitration award in any court of competent jurisdiction. [ECF No. 1-1](#).

Based on the narrow standard under which the Court reviews petitions to confirm arbitration awards, the Court hereby confirms the arbitration award of the “FINRA-DR” issued on or about August 12, 2011 against Defendant Barbara A. Lynn in FINRA-DR Case No. 10-02870.<sup>1</sup>

During the status conference held on September 6, 2017, the Court indicated that it would issue judgment based on the record established. *See* Minutes dated Sept. 6, 2017. Therefore, the Court’s opinion is *nunc pro tunc* as of September 6, 2017.

The Court will issue a separate Judgment Entry.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

October 30, 2017  
Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson  
Benita Y. Pearson  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> FINRA-DR Rule 2080 requires parties seeking expungement relief to name FINRA-DR as an additional party unless it waives the requirement. FINRA-DR has waived that requirement as to this matter. *See* [ECF No. 1-3](#).